



INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

January 26, 2015

Indiana Government Center South
Conference Room 22
302 W. Washington Street
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204
1:00 p.m. (EST)

Committee Members Present: Gordon Hendry (Chair), Dr. Brad Oliver, B.J. Watts (by phone) and Dr. David Freitas.

Committee Members Absent: None.

I. Call to Order/ Meeting Minutes Approval

The Chair Mr. Hendry called the meeting to order. Mr. Hendry invited a motion to approve the minutes from the December 18, 2014 committee meeting, and upon a motion and a second the minutes were approved 4-0.

II. Priority Initiatives: Teacher Evaluation Systems and Stakeholder Engagement¹

Mr. Hendry invited TNTP representative Jessica Conlon to address the committee. Ms. Conlon began by briefly outlining some background information regarding TNTP's work in Indiana. She stated that TNTP has been able to build on previous experience, as well reach out to a variety of stakeholders in forming their recommendations. She stated that TNTP held focus

¹ The following TNTP documents can be viewed: 1) Final Recommendations for Changes to Indiana's Evaluation System at http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/TNTP_Memo_Final_Recommendations_to_IN_SBOE_FINAL_1.23.15.pdf; 2) a presentation regarding Recommendations for Strengthening Indiana's Teacher Evaluation System at http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/TNTP_Presentation_Final_Recs_to_IN_SBOE_FINAL_1.23.15.pdf; 3) an Indiana Evaluation Focus Group Report at http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/TNTP_Report_Indiana_Evaluation_FG_Summary_FINAL_1.23.15.pdf; and 4) a Summary of TNTP's Recommendations at http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/TNTP_Recommendations_Chart_of_IN_Eval_Recommendations_FINAL_1.23.15.pdf.

groups in addition to survey responses. Mr. Hendry added that there is time for additional teacher engagement, and Ms. Conlon stated that TNTP will be reaching out to more teachers in collaboration with Board staff.

Ms. Conlon continued the presentation; she stated that teacher performance is the single most important “in school” factor for student learning. She then walked through the areas TNTP has identified for improvement. She also pointed out that while Indiana has done very well in the area of teacher evaluation, there is room for improvement. The two main general areas are 1) accurate evaluation for all teachers, and 2) implementation. Upon inquiry by Mr. Hendry, Ms. Conlon made it clear that the recommended evaluation system would not mean a bell curve; she stated that all teachers could end up with high ratings, for example.

Ms. Conlon explained the importance of implementation. She stated this can affect the perception of the system, and the accuracy of the results of the system. Ms. Conlon further stated that there is a need to balance the importance of local control with some oversight and monitoring of implementation. She spoke about the necessity of a culture shift which happens at a high level.

Ms. Conlon then moved on to the recommendations, which pertain to seven categories: 1) establishing a vision and a theory of action for the change management, 2) increasing focus on high-quality training, 3) objective measures of student performance, 4) educator engagement, 5) monitoring plans for consistency, 6) revisions to the state’s model plan, and 7) compensation models. Within each category, she outlined applicable legislative, regulatory, and implementation recommendations. Dr. Oliver commented on the importance of involving higher education going forward. Ms. Conlon said TNTP recommends alignment with high education.

Ms. Conlon spoke about the use of objective measures. She explained that teacher evaluations are composed of multiple measures, some of which are objective. She commented that the use of objective measures is best practice and helps provide a more accurate measure of teacher effectiveness as part of a system utilizing multiple measures. Ms. Conlon clarified that multiple factors can be used by schools that will count as objective measures, and that the assessment must be the primary objective measure of all the objective measures used. Ms. Conlon stated that TNTP recommends “significantly inform” be defined to prevent the wide variance in how that phrase is interpreted by districts. She stated that TNTP recommended setting a range of 33-50% for all objective measures combined. She said this range was determined through research as having a high rate of accuracy of predicting teacher impact on

student gains in the future. Upon inquiry by the committee members, Ms. Conlon clarified that the first year this would be effective would be the 2016-2017 school year.

Ms. Conlon informed the committee regarding the issue of tying teacher evaluation to compensation. She stated that some people have said they believe this causes skewed ratings. She stated that TNTP does not believe that this is the main cause. She stated that TNTP recommends 1) allowing teachers to be rated improvement necessary two years in a row, or improvement necessary followed by an ineffective rating before a salary increase is withheld, and 2) include a provision that allows teachers rated improvement necessary to apply for a waiver from the condition that they not be given a salary increase. The waiver can be granted if the teacher demonstrates extraordinary circumstances that impacted his/her ability to perform at an effective level. TNTP also recommended that the Board issue rules establishing the process and standards for reviewing and granting waivers. Dr. Oliver recommended that a study committee look at the systems and processes to determine if improvements can be made. The committee thanked Ms. Conlon for her presentation and work. The committee then took a short recess.

-- RECESS --

Mr. Hendry invited Danielle Shockey, Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction, to address the TNTP recommendations. She stated that they will have a written response coming out with the Board materials. She went on to say that two comments the Department has now are 1) INTASS already has an advisory Board that should be utilized, and 2) the Department would like to know the level of work on the fiscal impact the committee is seeking regarding the legislative pieces.

V. ESEA Update from IDOE's Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction, Danielle Shockey (moved up in the agenda)

Ms. Shockey then asked if she could give an update on the waiver early and Mr. Hendry agreed. She stated that the first of two calls with the US Department is on January 27, 2015, and that Board staff is joining for that call. Ms. Shockey stated that there are no drafts done yet and that the call will help address questions they have. She also said Department staff is just starting to work on the drafts. Ms. Shockey stated that the Board will receive redlines copies of waiver with changes for this submission.

Mr. Hendry moved to have TNTP's recommendations presented to the full Board at the next full Board meeting as an action item. The committee voted 4-0 to carry the motion.

III. The Balanced Scorecard (BSC) and Strategic Plan²

Mr. Hendry invited Ashley Cowger, Chief of Staff for the Board, to present on this issue. Ms. Cowger stated that she has been working with Kristin Reed, Policy and Research Coordinator at the Department, to populate the scorecard. Ms. Cowger stated that the scorecard is live. She also walked through updates to the scorecard, strategic plan updates, and next steps.

IV. Priority Initiative: Stakeholder Engagement³

Leroy Robinson, the Department's Director of Family and Community Engagement, presented to the committee. He said the Department contacted university professors to assist in creating a scientifically valid survey. Mr. Robinson also updated the committee on work with Great Lakes, as well as recommendations, updates on the existing surveys, and next steps for the parent survey process. Mr. Hendry stressed the importance of a scientific study; he said the current surveys are voluntary and is looking for more accuracy in the future. Mr. Robinson stated that the Department will continue to work on this. Mr. Hendry said he wants to rely on the information as reliable. Dr. Freitas added that things other than the survey would be reviewed, like focus groups and structured interviews.

VI. Follow-Up by Sarah Pies, IDOE Educator Effectiveness Specialist, from January 7th SBOE Meeting⁴

² The Board staff presentation can be viewed at http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/SPC_Slides_1_26_15.pdf and the Board staff recommendations can be viewed at [http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/Strategic_Plan_Recommended_Goal_1.1.10_\(CCR\).pdf](http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/Strategic_Plan_Recommended_Goal_1.1.10_(CCR).pdf).

³ The Department's presentation can be viewed at http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/SBOE_Strategy_Committee_Update_on_1-26-15_Family_Engagement_Survey.pdf and a report from the Harvard Family Research Project can be viewed at <http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/DataCollectionInstrumentsForEvaluatingFamilyInvolvement.pdf>.

⁴ The Department presentation can be viewed at http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/strategic_planning_presentation_Jan_2015.pdf and the data sheet can be viewed at <http://www.in.gov/sboe/2603.htm> under this agenda item.

Ms. Pies presented to the committee regarding staff performance evaluation results. She said the ratings for 2013-14 were similar to 2012-13. Ms. Pies then informed the committee of specific data and breakdowns of the evaluation results for the 2013-14 year. Ms. Pies also walked through some student growth and achievement data charts. Ms. Pies gave an example of a district in which only 10% of the evaluation was based on objective measures. She stated that the Department told the district this isn't in line with the RISE model and that the district needed to create an action plan on how they objective measures significantly inform the evaluation. She stated the district gave data back showing it did significantly inform the evaluation because using that data changed some grades.

The committee adjourned.